arXiv:1605.05895v1 [math.AP] 19 May 2016

MINIMAL BLOW-UP MASSES AND EXISTENCE OF SOLUTIONS FOR AN ASYMMETRIC SINH-POISSON EQUATION

TONIA RICCIARDI AND GABRIELLA ZECCA

Abstract. For a sinh-Poisson type problem with asymmetric exponents of interest in hydrodynamic turbulence, we establish the optimal lower bounds for the blow-up masses. We apply this result to construct solutions of mountain pass type on two-dimensional tori.

1. Introduction and main results

Motivated by the equations introduced in the context of hydrodynamic turbulence by Onsager in [18] and by Sawada and Suzuki in [27], we study the following sinh-Poisson type problem:

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_g v = \lambda_1 \dfrac{e^v}{\int_\Sigma e^v \, dV_g} - \lambda_2 \dfrac{e^{-\gamma v}}{\int_\Sigma e^{-\gamma v} \, dV_g} - \kappa & \text{on } \Sigma \\ \displaystyle\int_\Sigma v \, dV_g = 0. \end{cases} \tag{1.1}$$

Here, the unknown function v corresponds to the stream function of the turbulent Euler flow, (Σ, g) is a compact, orientable, Riemannian 2-manifold without boundary, the constant $\gamma \in (0, 1]$ describes the intensity of the negatively oriented vortices, and $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 > 0$ are constants related to the inverse temperature, $\kappa \in \mathbb{R}$ is given by

$$\kappa = \frac{\lambda_1 - \lambda_2}{|\Sigma|},$$

where $|\Sigma| = \int_\Sigma dV_g$ is the volume of Σ. The constant κ ensures that the right hand side in (1.1) has zero mean value. The trivial solution $v \equiv 0$ always exists for (1.1).

Problem (1.1) admits a variational structure. Indeed, (1.1) is the Euler-Lagrange equation of the functional:

$$J(v) = \frac{1}{2} \int_\Sigma |\nabla v|^2 \, dV_g - \lambda_1 \log \int_\Sigma e^v dV_g - \frac{\lambda_2}{\gamma} \log \int_\Sigma e^{-\gamma v} \, dV_g$$

defined on the space

$$\mathcal{E} = \left\{ v \in H^1(\Sigma) : \int_\Sigma v \, dV_g = 0 \right\}.$$

With this notation, v is a classical solution for (1.1) if and only if v is a critical point for J in $\mathcal{E}$.

When $\gamma = 1$, problem (1.1) reduces to the mean field equation for equilibrium turbulence derived in [13, 20], under the assumption that the point vortices have equal intensities and arbitrary orientation. This case has received a considerable attention in recent years. In particular, existence of saddle point solutions was obtained in [9, 23, 31]; such results exploit the blow-up analysis derived in [12, 17] in order to establish the compactness of solution sequences. A detailed blow-up analysis is also contained in [10]. By the Lyapunov-Schmidt approach introduced in [6], sign-changing concentrating solutions for a related local sinh-Poisson type equation were constructed in [1] and sign-changing bubble-tower solutions were constructed in [8].

The case $\gamma \neq 1$ corresponds to the assumption where all positively oriented point vortices have unit intensity and all negatively oriented point vortices have intensity equal to γ. Such

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 35J61, 35J20, 35B44, 35R01.

Key words and phrases. sinh-Poisson equation, blow-up solutions, turbulent Euler flow.

a case already appears in an unpublished manuscript of Onsager [7], although the rigorous derivation of (1.1) is due to [27]. Actually, the mean field equation derived in [27] concerns the very general case where the point vortex intensity is described by a Borel probability measure $\mathcal{P} \in \mathcal{M}([-1,1])$; it is given by

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_g v = \lambda \displaystyle\int_{[-1,1]} \alpha \left(\frac{e^{\alpha v}}{\int_\Sigma e^{\alpha v}\, dV_g} - \frac{1}{|\Sigma|} \right) \mathcal{P}(d\alpha) \quad \text{on } \Sigma \\ \displaystyle\int_\Sigma v\, dV_g = 0, \end{cases} \tag{1.2}$$

where $\lambda > 0$ is a constant related to the inverse temperature. The variational functional for (1.2) takes the form

$$J_{\mathcal{P}}(v) = \frac{1}{2} \int_\Sigma |\nabla v|^2\, dV_g - \lambda \int_{[-1,1]} \log \left(\int_\Sigma e^{\alpha v}\, dV_g \right) \mathcal{P}(d\alpha), \qquad v \in \mathcal{E}. \tag{1.3}$$

In this context, problem (1.1) corresponds to the case

$$\mathcal{P} = \tau \delta_1 + (1-\tau)\delta_{-\gamma}, \qquad \lambda_1 = \lambda\tau,\ \lambda_2 = \lambda\gamma(1-\tau). \tag{1.4}$$

Problem (1.2) was analyzed in [15, 24], where concentration properties for non-compact solution sequences is studied in the spirit of [2]. The optimal Moser-Trudinger constant for $J_{\mathcal{P}}$ is computed in [21]. More precisely, it is shown in [21] that $J_{\mathcal{P}}$ is bounded from below if $\lambda < \bar{\lambda}$, where

$$\bar{\lambda} = 8\pi \inf \left\{ \frac{\mathcal{P}(K_\pm)}{\left(\int_{K_\pm} \alpha\, \mathcal{P}(d\alpha) \right)^2} :\ K_\pm \subset I_\pm \cap \mathrm{supp}\mathcal{P} \right\}, \tag{1.5}$$

where $I_+ := [0,1]$ and $I_- = [-1,0)$, $K_\pm$ are Borel sets. On the other hand, $J_{\mathcal{P}}$ is unbounded from below if $\lambda > \bar{\lambda}$. In the case where $\mathcal{P}$ is discrete, an equivalent form of (1.5) was derived in [28] in the context of Liouville systems. However, particularly with respect to the blow-up behavior of solutions, it appears complicated to further analyze (1.2) in its full generality. Therefore, recent effort has been devoted to study cases where $\mathcal{P}$ is the sum of two Dirac masses, such as (1.1). In particular, for *small* values of γ, existence results for (1.1) in planar domains with holes were obtained in [22]; sign-changing blow-up solutions for a local Dirichlet problem related to (1.1) are constructed in [19]. The case $\gamma = 1/2$ is equivalent to the Tzitzéica equation describing surfaces of constant affine curvature, and was recently analyzed in [11].

Here, we are concerned with the existence and blow-up properties of (1.1) for *general* values of $\gamma \in (0,1]$. It is known [2, 15, 24] that unbounded solution sequences for problem (1.1) necessarily concentrate on a finite set $\mathcal{S} \subset \Sigma$. Our first aim in this note is to derive the optimal lower bounds for the blow-up masses, see Theorem 1.1 below.

Then, we apply the blow-up analysis results to the construction of a non-zero solution for (1.1) via a mountain pass argument, provided the compact surface Σ satisfies a suitable condition concerning the first eigenvalue, see Theorem 1.2 below.

In order to state our results precisely, we introduce some notation. Let $(\lambda_{1,n}, \lambda_{2,n}, v_n)$ be a solution sequence to (1.1). If v_n is unbounded in $L^\infty(\Sigma)$, then, up to subsequences, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_{1,n} \frac{e^{v_n}}{\int_\Sigma e^{v_n}\, dV_g}\, dV_g &\overset{*}{\rightharpoonup} \sum_{p \in \mathcal{S}_1} m_1(p)\delta_p + r_1\, dV_g, \\ \lambda_{2,n} \frac{e^{-\gamma v_n}}{\int_\Sigma e^{-\gamma v_n}\, dV_g}\, dV_g &\overset{*}{\rightharpoonup} \sum_{p \in \mathcal{S}_2} m_2(p)\delta_p + r_2\, dV_g, \end{aligned} \tag{1.6}$$

weakly in the sense of measures, where the blow-up sets $\mathcal{S}_1, \mathcal{S}_2 \subset \Sigma$ are finite, the "blow-up masses" $m_i(p)$ satisfy the lower bound $m_i(p) \geq 4\pi$ for all $p \in \mathcal{S}_1 \cup \mathcal{S}_2$, $r_i \in L^1(\Sigma)$, $i = 1, 2$. See Lemma 2.1 below for a more detailed statement. Our first aim is to improve the lower bound for the blow-up masses m_i, $i = 1, 2$.

Theorem 1.1. *Let $(\lambda_{1,n}, \lambda_{2,n}, v_n)$ be a concentrating solution sequence for* (1.1) *and suppose that* (1.6) *holds. Then, the blow-up masses satisfy the following lower bounds:*

$$m_1(p) \geq 8\pi \ \forall p \in \mathcal{S}_1; \quad m_2(p) \geq \frac{8\pi}{\gamma} \ \forall p \in \mathcal{S}_2. \tag{1.7}$$

We apply Theorem 1.1 to derive the existence of non-zero mountain-pass solutions to problem (1.1). In order to state the existence result, we denote by $\mu_1(\Sigma)$ the first positive eigenvalue of $-\Delta_g$ on Σ, namely

$$\mu_1(\Sigma) := \inf_{\phi \in \mathcal{E} \setminus \{0\}} \frac{\int_\Sigma |\nabla \phi|^2 \, dV_g}{\int_\Sigma \phi^2 \, dV_g}. \tag{1.8}$$

Our existence result holds for surfaces Σ satisfying the condition

$$8\pi < \mu_1(\Sigma)|\Sigma| < 16\pi(1+\gamma). \tag{1.9}$$

Condition (1.9) is satisfied, e.g., when Σ is the flat torus $\mathbb{R}^2/\mathbb{Z}^2$, since in this case $\mu_1(\Sigma)|\Sigma| = 4\pi^2$. Let

$$\Lambda := \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} & (i) \qquad \lambda_1, \lambda_2 \geq 0, \max\{\lambda_1, \gamma\lambda_2\} > 8\pi \\ (\lambda_1, \lambda_2) \subset \mathbb{R}^2 : & (ii) \qquad \lambda_1 \notin 8\pi\mathbb{N}, \ \lambda_2 \notin \dfrac{8\pi}{\gamma}\mathbb{N} \\ & (ii) \qquad \lambda_1 + \gamma\lambda_2 < \mu_1(\Sigma)|\Sigma| \end{array} \right\}. \tag{1.10}$$

Our existence result is the following.

Theorem 1.2. *Suppose* (Σ, g) *satisfies* (1.9). *Then, there exists a nontrivial solution to* (1.1) *for all* $(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) \in \Lambda$.

We note that condition (1.9) implies $\Lambda \neq \emptyset$. More precisely, Λ is a union of two (possibly overlapping) triangles T_1, T_2, where T_1 has vertices $\{(8\pi, 0), (\mu_1(\Sigma)|\Sigma|, 0), (8\pi, (\mu_1(\Sigma)|\Sigma| - 8\pi)/\gamma)\}$, and T_2 has vertices $\{(0, 8\pi/\gamma), (0, \mu_1(\Sigma)|\Sigma|/\gamma), (\mu_1(\Sigma)|\Sigma| - 8\pi, 8\pi/\gamma)\}$.

The remaining part of this note is devoted to the proof of Theorem 1.1 and Theorem 1.2. The proof of Theorem 1.1 is in the spirit of [16, 26], where the case $\gamma = 1$ is considered. The case $\gamma \neq 1$ introduces an asymmetry in the problem, which requires some careful modifications in the proof. The proof of Theorem 1.2 relies on the variational setting introduced in [30, 14, 23], based on Struwe's monotonicity trick [29]. In view of the improved lower bounds for blow-up masses, as stated in Theorem 1.1, Theorem 1.2 with $\gamma = 1$ is more general than the corresponding result in [23].

Notation. We denote by $C > 0$ a general constant whose actual value may vary from line to line. When the integration variable is clear, we may omit it. We take subsequences without further notice. We set $\|\cdot\| = \|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{E}}$.

2. Proof of Theorem 1.1

This section is devoted to the proof of Theorem 1.1. We denote by $(\lambda_{1,n}, \lambda_{2,n}, v_n)$ a solution sequence to (1.1) with $\lambda_{1,n} \to \lambda_{1,0} \in \mathbb{R}$, $\lambda_{2,n} \to \lambda_{2,0} \in \mathbb{R}$, as $n \to \infty$. We define the measures $\mu_{1,n}, \mu_{2,n} \in \mathcal{M}(\Sigma)$ by

$$\mu_{1,n} = \lambda_{1,n} \frac{e^{v_n}}{\int_\Sigma e^{v_n}} \, dV_g, \qquad \mu_{2,n} = \lambda_{2,n} \frac{e^{-\gamma v_n}}{\int_\Sigma e^{-\gamma v_n}} \, dV_g. \tag{2.1}$$

We may assume that $\mu_{i,n} \overset{*}{\rightharpoonup} \mu_i \in \mathcal{M}(\Sigma)$ weakly in the sense of measures, $i = 1, 2$. We define the blow-up sets:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{S}_1 &= \{p \in \Sigma : \exists \, p_n \to p \text{ s.t. } v_n(p_n) \to +\infty)\} \\ \mathcal{S}_2 &= \{p \in \Sigma : \exists \, p_n \to p \text{ s.t. } v_n(p_n) \to -\infty)\} \end{aligned}$$

and we denote $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{S}_1 \cup \mathcal{S}_2$.

For the reader's convenience and in order to fix notation, we collect in the following lemma the necessary known blow-up results for (1.1).

Lemma 2.1 ([15, 24])**.** *For the solution sequence* $(\lambda_{1,n}, \lambda_{2,n}, v_n)$ *the following alternative holds.*

1) *Compactness:* $\limsup_{n\to\infty}\|v_n\|_\infty < +\infty$. *We have* $\mathcal{S}=\emptyset$ *and there exist a solution* $v\in\mathcal{E}$ *to* (1.1) *with* $\lambda_1=\lambda_{1,0}$ *and* $\lambda_2=\lambda_{2,0}$ *and a subsequence* $\{v_{n_k}\}$ *such that* $v_{n_k}\to v$ *in* $\mathcal{E}$.
2) *Concentration:* $\limsup_{n\to\infty}\|v_n\|_\infty = +\infty$. *We have* $\mathcal{S}\neq\emptyset$ *and*

$$\mu_1 = \sum_{p\in\mathcal{S}_1} m_1(p)\delta_p + r_1\,dV_g$$
$$\mu_2 = \sum_{p\in\mathcal{S}_2} m_2(p)\delta_p + r_2\,dV_g$$

where δ_p *denotes the Dirac delta centered at* $p\in\mathcal{S}$. *The constants* $m_1(p)$, $m_2(p)$ *satisfy the lower bound*

$$m_i(p)\geqslant 4\pi, \qquad i=1,2 \tag{2.2}$$

and $r_i\in L^1(\Sigma)\cap L^\infty_{loc}(\Sigma\setminus\mathcal{S})$. *Moreover, for every* $p\in\mathcal{S}_1\cap\mathcal{S}_2$, *we have*

$$8\pi\left[m_1(p)+\frac{m_2(p)}{\gamma}\right] = [m_1(p)-m_2(p)]^2. \tag{2.3}$$

We note that (2.3) implies that for all $p\in\mathcal{S}_1\setminus\mathcal{S}_2$ we have $m_2(p)=0$ and therefore $m_1(p)=8\pi$. Similarly, for every $p\in\mathcal{S}_2\setminus\mathcal{S}_1$ we have $m_1(p)=0$ and therefore $m_2(p)=\frac{8\pi}{\gamma}$. In particular, Theorem 1.1 is satisfied for $p\in(\mathcal{S}_1\setminus\mathcal{S}_2)\cup(\mathcal{S}_2\setminus\mathcal{S}_1)$. Therefore, henceforth we assume $p\in\mathcal{S}_1\cap\mathcal{S}_2$. Let $\mathcal{O}\subset\mathbb{R}^2$ be a smooth bounded open set. We shall need the following version of the Brezis-Merle type alternatives for Liouville systems.

Lemma 2.2 ([14])**.** *Suppose* $(w_{1,n},w_{2,n})$ *is a solution sequence to the Liouville system*

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta w_{1,n} = aV_{1,n}e^{w_{1,n}} - bV_{2,n}e^{w_{2,n}} & \text{in } \mathcal{O} \\ -\Delta w_{2,n} = -cV_{1,n}e^{w_{1,n}} + dV_{2,n}e^{w_{2,n}} & \text{in } \mathcal{O}, \end{cases} \tag{2.4}$$

where $V_{i,n}\in L^\infty(\mathcal{O})$, $i=1,2$, *are given functions,* $a,b,c,d>0$ *are fixed constants and*

$$0\leqslant V_{i,n}\leq C, \quad \int_{\mathcal{O}} e^{w_{i,n}}\leq C, \qquad i=1,2. \tag{2.5}$$

Then, up to subsequences, exactly one of the following alternatives holds true.

1. Both $w_{1,n}$ *and* $w_{2,n}$ *are locally uniformly bounded in* $\mathcal{O}$.
2. There is $i\in\{1,2\}$ *such that* $w_{i,n}$ *is uniformly bounded in* $\mathcal{O}$ *and* $w_{j,n}\to-\infty$ *locally uniformly in* $\mathcal{O}$ *for* $j\neq i$.
3. Both $w_{1,n}\to-\infty$ *and* $w_{2,n}\to-\infty$ *locally uniformly in* $\mathcal{O}$.
4. For the blow-up sets $\mathcal{S}_1^0$, $\mathcal{S}_2^0$ *defined for this subsequence, we have* $\mathcal{S}_1^0\cup\mathcal{S}_2^0\neq\emptyset$ *and* $\sharp(\mathcal{S}_1^0\cup\mathcal{S}_2^0)<+\infty$. *Furthermore, for each* $i\in\{1,2\}$, *either* $w_{i,n}$ *is locally uniformly bounded in* $\mathcal{O}\setminus(S_1^0\cup\mathcal{S}_2^0)$ *or* $w_{i,n}\to-\infty$ *locally uniformly in* $\mathcal{O}\setminus(S_1^0\cup\mathcal{S}_2^0)$. *Here, if* $\mathcal{S}_i^0\setminus(S_1^0\cap\mathcal{S}_2^0)\neq\emptyset$ *then* $w_{i,n}\to-\infty$ *locally uniformly in* $\mathcal{O}\setminus(S_1^0\cup\mathcal{S}_2^0)$, *and each* $x_0\in\mathcal{S}_i^0$ *satisfies* $m_i(x_0)\geq 4\pi$ *such that*

$$V_{i,n}(x)e^{w_{i,n}} \rightharpoonup \sum_{x_0\in\mathcal{S}_i^0} m_i(x_0)\delta_{x_0} \qquad *\text{-weakly in } \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{O}),$$

$i=1,2$.

Proof. For the case $a=c=2$, $b=d=1$, corresponding to the case of the Toda system, Lemma 2.1 was established in [14], Theorem 4.2. However, by carefully inspecting the proof in [14], it is clear that Theorem 4.2 in [14] holds true for general $a,b,c,d>0$. □

We also use the following known result.

Lemma 2.3. *Let* $p_0\in\mathcal{S}_1\cap\mathcal{S}_2$. *There exists a sequence* $x_{1,n}\to p_0$ *and a sequence* $x_{2,n}\to p_0$ *such that:*
i) $v_n(x_{1,n})\to+\infty$, $\quad v_n(x_{1,n})-\log\int_\Sigma e^{v_n}\to+\infty$,
ii) $-v_n(x_{2,n})\to+\infty$, $\quad -v_n(x_{2,n})-\frac{1}{\gamma}\log\int_\Sigma e^{-\gamma v_n}\to+\infty$.

We can now complete the proof of our first result.

Proof of Theorem 1.1. We denote by $(\Psi,\mathcal{U})$ an isothermal chart satisfying $\bar{\mathcal{U}}\cap\mathcal{S}=\{p_0\}$, $\Psi(\mathcal{U})=\mathcal{O}\subset\mathbb{R}^2$ and

$$\Psi(p_0)=0,\qquad g(X)=e^{\xi(X)}(dX_1^2+dX_2^2),\qquad \xi(0)=0, \tag{2.6}$$

where $X=(X_1,X_2)$ denotes a coordinate system on $\mathcal{O}$. In particular, identifying $\varphi(X)=v(\Psi^{-1}(X))$ for any function φ defined on Σ, we have that a solution v to equation (1.1) satisfies

$$-\Delta v=\lambda_1 e^{\xi}\frac{e^v}{\int_\Sigma e^v}-\lambda_2 e^{\xi}\frac{e^{-\gamma v}}{\int_\Sigma e^{-\gamma v}}-\kappa e^{\xi}\qquad\text{in }\mathcal{O}.$$

We define h_ξ by

$$\begin{cases}-\Delta h_\xi=e^{\xi} & \text{in }\mathcal{O},\\ h_\xi=0 & \text{on }\partial\mathcal{O}.\end{cases} \tag{2.7}$$

For the solution sequence $(\lambda_{1,n},\lambda_{2,n},v_n)$ to (1.1) such that $\lambda_{1,n}\to\lambda_{1,0}$ and $\lambda_{2,n}\to\lambda_{2,0}$, we define $w_{i,n}:\mathcal{O}\to\mathbb{R}$, $i=1,2$, by setting

$$\begin{aligned}w_{1,n}&:=v_n-\log\int_\Sigma e^{v_n}+\kappa h_\xi,\\ w_{2,n}&:=-\gamma v_n-\log\int_\Sigma e^{-\gamma v_n}-\gamma\kappa h_\xi,\end{aligned}$$

where, as before, we identify $v_n(X)=v_n(\Psi^{-1}(X))$. Then, the above definitions imply that

$$\frac{e^{v_n}}{\int_\Sigma e^{v_n}}=e^{w_{1,n}-\kappa h_\xi},\qquad\qquad \frac{e^{-\gamma v_n}}{\int_\Sigma e^{-\gamma v_n}}=e^{w_{2,n}+\gamma\kappa h_\xi}.$$

Setting

$$V_{1,n}:=\lambda_{1,n}e^{\xi-\kappa h_\xi},\qquad\qquad V_{2,n}:=\lambda_{2,n}e^{\xi+\gamma\kappa h_\xi}, \tag{2.8}$$

we may write

$$\begin{aligned}V_{1,n}e^{w_{1,n}}&=\lambda_{1,n}e^{\xi-\kappa h_\xi}\frac{e^{v_n}}{\int_\Sigma e^{v_n}}e^{\kappa h_\xi}=\lambda_{1,n}e^{\xi}\frac{e^v}{\int_\Sigma e^v}\\ V_{2,n}e^{w_{2,n}}&=\lambda_{2,n}e^{\xi+\gamma\kappa h_\xi}\frac{e^{-\gamma v_n}}{\int_\Sigma e^{-\gamma v_n}}e^{-\gamma\kappa h_\xi}=\lambda_{2,n}e^{\xi}\frac{e^{-\gamma v_n}}{\int_\Sigma e^{-\gamma v_n}}\end{aligned} \tag{2.9}$$

By definition of $w_{1,n}$, $w_{2,n}$ and h_ξ, we thus have

$$-\Delta w_{1,2}=-\Delta v_n+\kappa e^{\xi}=\lambda_{1,n}e^{\xi}\frac{e^v}{\int_\Sigma e^v}-\lambda_{2,n}e^{\xi}\frac{e^{-\gamma v_n}}{\int_\Sigma e^{-\gamma v_n}}$$

and

$$\Delta w_{2,n}=\gamma\Delta v_n-\gamma\kappa e^{\xi}=-\gamma\lambda_{1,n}e^{\xi}\frac{e^v}{\int_\Sigma e^v}+\gamma\lambda_{2,n}e^{\xi}\frac{e^{-\gamma v_n}}{\int_\Sigma e^{-\gamma v_n}}.$$

In particular, $(w_{1,n},w_{2,n})$ is a solution to the Liouville system

$$\begin{cases}-\Delta w_{1,n}=V_{1,n}e^{w_{1,n}}-V_{2,n}e^{\gamma w_{2,n}} & \text{in }\mathcal{O}\\ -\Delta w_{2,n}=-\gamma V_{1,n}e^{w_{1,n}}+\gamma V_{2,n}e^{\gamma w_{2,n}} & \text{in }\mathcal{O},\end{cases} \tag{2.10}$$

which is of the form (2.4) with $a=b=1$, $c=d=\gamma$. We claim that solutions to (2.10) satisfy the estimates (2.5) in view of (2.9). Indeed, we have

$$0\le V_{i,n}\le\sup_n\lambda_{i,n}e^{\|\xi\|_\infty+\kappa\|h_\xi\|_\infty}\le C,\qquad i=1,2.$$

Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\mathcal{O}}e^{w_{1,n}}&=\int_{\mathcal{O}}\frac{e^{v_n}}{\int_\Sigma e^{v_n}}e^{\kappa h_\xi}\le e^{\kappa\|h_\xi\|_\infty}\\ \int_{\mathcal{O}}e^{w_{2,n}}&=\int_{\mathcal{O}}\frac{e^{-\gamma v_n}}{\int_\Sigma e^{-\gamma v_n}}e^{-\gamma\kappa h_\xi}\le e^{\gamma\kappa\|h_\xi\|_\infty}.\end{aligned}$$

For later use, we also note that

$$w_{1,n} + \frac{1}{\gamma} w_{2,n} = -\log \int_\Sigma e^v - \frac{1}{\gamma} \log \int_\Sigma e^{-\gamma v} \leqslant C. \tag{2.11}$$

We define

$$V_1 = \lambda_{1,0}\, e^{\xi - \kappa h_\xi}, \qquad V_2 = \lambda_{2,0}\, e^{\xi + \gamma\kappa h_\xi},$$

so that $V_{i,n} \to V_i$, $i = 1, 2$, uniformly on $\overline{\mathcal{O}}$. We also define

$$\mathcal{S}_i^0 = \{X \in \mathcal{O} : \exists X_n \to X \text{ s.t. } w_{i,n}(X_n) \to +\infty\}, \quad i = 1, 2.$$

In view of Lemma 2.3 there exist $x_{1,n}$ and $x_{2,n}$ such that $x_{1,n} \to p_0$, $v_n(x_{1,n}) \to +\infty$, $x_{2,n} \to p_0$ and $-v_n(x_{2,n}) \to +\infty$, and furthermore

$$\begin{aligned} X_{1,n} = \Psi(x_{1,n}) \to 0 \quad &\text{and} \quad w_{1,n}(X_{1,n}) \to +\infty \\ X_{2,n} = \Psi(x_{2,n}) \to 0 \quad &\text{and} \quad w_{2,n}(X_{2,n}) \to +\infty. \end{aligned}$$

In particular, $0 \in \mathcal{S}_1^0 \cap \mathcal{S}_2^0$ and

$$\mathcal{S}_1^0 = \Psi(\mathcal{U} \cap \mathcal{S}_1) = \{0\} = \Psi(\mathcal{U} \cap \mathcal{S}_2) = \mathcal{S}_2^0. \tag{2.12}$$

On the other hand, in view of (2.9) and recalling that $\xi(0) = 0$, we note that

$$\begin{aligned} V_{1,n} e^{w_{1,n}}\, dX &\overset{*}{\rightharpoonup} m_1(p_0)\delta_{X=0} + s_1(X)\, dX, \\ V_{2,n} e^{w_{2,n}}\, dX &\overset{*}{\rightharpoonup} m_2(p_0)\delta_{X=0} + s_2(X)\, dX, \end{aligned} \tag{2.13}$$

$*$-weakly in $\mathcal{M}(\bar{\mathcal{O}})$, where $s_i(X) = r_i(\Psi^{-1}(X))e^{\xi(X)}$, $s_i \in L^1(\mathcal{O}) \cap L^\infty_{loc}(\bar{\mathcal{O}} \setminus \{0\})$ and $m_i(p_0) \geq 4\pi$, $i = 1, 2$. In view of (2.12) there exist $Y_{1,n}, Y_{2,n} \in \mathcal{O}$, $Y_{1,n}, Y_{2,n} \to 0$ such that

$$w_{i,n}(Y_{i,n}) = \sup_{\mathcal{O}} w_{i,n} \to +\infty, \quad i = 1, 2.$$

In order to conclude the proof, we rescale the Liouville system (2.10) twice.

Proof of $m_1(p_0) \geq 8\pi$. We first rescale (2.10) around $Y_{1,n}$ with respect the rescaling parameter

$$\varepsilon_{1,n} = e^{-w_{1,n}(Y_{1,n})/2},$$

that is $w_{1,n}(Y_{1,n}) = \sup_{\mathcal{O}} w_{1,n} = -2\log \varepsilon_{1,n}$.

Namely, we define the expanding domain

$$\mathcal{O}_n^1 = \{X \in \mathbb{R}^2 : \ Y_{1,n} + \varepsilon_{1,n} X \in \mathcal{O}\}$$

and we define $\widetilde{w}_{1,n}^1, \widetilde{w}_{2,n}^1 : \mathcal{O}_n^1 \to \mathbb{R}$ by setting

$$\begin{aligned} \widetilde{w}_{1,n}^1(X) &= w_{1,n}(Y_{1,n} + \varepsilon_{1,n} X) - w_{1,n}(Y_{1,n}) \\ \widetilde{w}_{2,n}^1(X) &= w_{2,n}(Y_{1,n} + \varepsilon_{1,n} X) - w_{1,n}(Y_{1,n}). \end{aligned}$$

Then, $\widetilde{w}_{1,n}^1, \widetilde{w}_{2,n}^1$ is a solution for the Liouville system

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta \widetilde{w}_{1,n}^1 = \widetilde{V}_{1,n}^1 e^{\widetilde{w}_{1,n}^1} - \widetilde{V}_{2,n}^1 e^{\widetilde{w}_{2,n}^1} \\ -\Delta \widetilde{w}_{2,n}^1 = -\gamma \widetilde{V}_{1,n}^1 e^{\widetilde{w}_{1,n}^1} + \gamma \widetilde{V}_{2,n}^1 e^{\widetilde{w}_{2,n}^1} \end{cases} \tag{2.14}$$

in $\mathcal{O}_n^1$, where $\widetilde{V}_{1,n}^1(X) = V_{1,n}(Y_{1,n} + \varepsilon_{1,n} X)$ and $\widetilde{V}_{2,n}^1(X) = V_{2,n}(Y_{1,n} + \varepsilon_{1,n} X)$, which is of the form (2.4) with $a = b = 1$, $c = d = \gamma$. Moreover, (2.5) is satisfied since $0 \leq \widetilde{V}_{i,n}^1 \leq C$ and

$$\int_{\mathcal{O}_n^1} e^{\widetilde{w}_{i,n}^1}\, dX = \int_{\mathcal{O}} e^{w_{i,n}}\, dX \leq C.$$

We also note that (2.11) implies that

$$\widetilde{w}_{1,n}^1(X) \leq \widetilde{w}_{1,n}^1(0) = 0, \qquad \widetilde{w}_{1,n}^1 + \frac{1}{\gamma} \widetilde{w}_{2,n}^1 \to -\infty. \tag{2.15}$$

We apply Lemma 2.2 on a ball $B_R \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ of fixed large radius $R > 0$. In view of (2.15) we rule out Alternative 1 and Alternative 3. Suppose Alternative 2. holds. Then, $\widetilde{w}_{1,n}^1$ is uniformly bounded in B_R and $\widetilde{w}_{2,n}^1 \to -\infty$ locally uniformly in B_R. In particular, there

exists $\widetilde{w}_1^1 \in C^{1,\alpha}_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^2)$ such that $\widetilde{w}_{1,n}^1 \to \widetilde{w}_1^1$, $e^{\widetilde{w}_{2,n}^1} \to 0$, locally uniformly in $\mathbb{R}^2$. Consequently, we derive that $\widetilde{w}_1^1$ satisfies the Liouville equation

$$-\Delta \widetilde{w}_1^1 = V_1 e^{\widetilde{w}_1^1} \qquad \text{on } \mathbb{R}^2.$$

Since

$$\int_{B_R} e^{\widetilde{w}_1^1} = \lim_n \int_{B_R} e^{\widetilde{w}_{1,n}^1} \leq \int_{\mathcal{O}_n^1} e^{\widetilde{w}_{1,n}^1} \leq C$$

we also have $\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} e^{\widetilde{w}_1^1} \leq C$. Now the classification theorem in [4] implies that $\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} V_1 e^{\widetilde{w}_1^1} = 8\pi$ and consequently $m_1(p_0) = 8\pi$. This established the asserted lower bound $m_1(p_0) \geq 8\pi$ in the case where $\widetilde{w}_{1,n}^1, \widetilde{w}_{2,n}^1$ satisfy Alternative 2. Suppose Alternative 4 holds. Then $\widetilde{w}_{1,n}^1$ is locally uniformly bounded,$\mathcal{S}_1^0 = \emptyset$, $\mathcal{S}_2^0 \neq \emptyset$ and $\widetilde{w}_{2,n}^1 \to -\infty$ locally uniformly. Moreover,

$$\widetilde{V}_{2,n} e^{\widetilde{w}_{2,n}^1}\, dX \overset{*}{\rightharpoonup} m_2(x_0)\delta_0.$$

We conclude that there exists $\widetilde{w}_1^1 \in C^{1,\alpha}_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^2)$ such that $\widetilde{w}_{1,n}^1 \to \widetilde{w}_1^1$ locally uniformly,

$$-\Delta \widetilde{w}_1^1 = V_1 e^{\widetilde{w}_1^1} - m_2(x_0)\delta_{x_0}.$$

In view of [5] we conclude that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} V_1 e^{\widetilde{w}_1^1} > 4\pi + m_2(x_0) > 8\pi,$$

and the asserted lower bound $m_1(x_0) \geq 8\pi$ holds true in this case as well.

Proof of $m_2(p_0) \geq \frac{8\pi}{\gamma}$. Similarly as above, we rescale (2.10) around $Y_{2,n}$ with respect to $\varepsilon_{2,n}$ given by

$$\varepsilon_{2,n} = e^{-w_{2,n}(Y_{2,n})/2},$$

that is $w_{2,n}(Y_{2,n}) = \sup_{\mathcal{O}} w_{2,n} = -2\log \varepsilon_{2,n}$. We define the expanding domain

$$\mathcal{O}_n^2 = \{X \in \mathbb{R}^2 : \ Y_{2,n} + \varepsilon_{2,n} X \in \mathcal{O}\}$$

and we define $\widetilde{w}_{1,n}^2, \widetilde{w}_{2,n}^2 : \mathcal{O}_n^2 \to \mathbb{R}$ by setting

$$\begin{aligned}\widetilde{w}_{1,n}^2(X) =& w_{1,n}(Y_{2,n} + \varepsilon_{2,n}X) - w_{2,n}(Y_{2,n})\\ \widetilde{w}_{2,n}^2(X) =& w_{2,n}(Y_{2,n} + \varepsilon_{2,n}X) - w_{2,n}(Y_{2,n}).\end{aligned}$$

Then, $\widetilde{w}_{1,n}^2, \widetilde{w}_{2,n}^2$ is a solution for the Liouville system

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta \widetilde{w}_{1,n}^2 = \widetilde{V}_{1,n}^2 e^{\widetilde{w}_{1,n}^2} - \widetilde{V}_{2,n}^2 e^{\widetilde{w}_{2,n}^2} \\ -\Delta \widetilde{w}_{2,n}^2 = -\gamma \widetilde{V}_{1,n}^2 e^{\widetilde{w}_{1,n}^2} + \gamma \widetilde{V}_{2,n}^2 e^{\widetilde{w}_{2,n}^2} \end{cases} \tag{2.16}$$

in $\mathcal{O}_n^2$, where $\widetilde{V}_{1,n}^2(X) = V_{1,n}(Y_{2,n} + \varepsilon_{2,n}X)$ and $\widetilde{V}_{2,n}^2(X) = V_{2,n}(Y_{2,n} + \varepsilon_{2,n}X)$. Furthermore, as above,

$$\widetilde{w}_{1,n}^2 + \frac{1}{\gamma}\widetilde{w}_{2,n}^2 \to -\infty.$$

We observe that

$$0 \leqslant \widetilde{V}_{i,n}^2(X) \leqslant C, \qquad \int_{\mathcal{O}_n^2} e^{\widetilde{w}_{i,n}^2}\, dX \leqslant C$$

for $i, = 1, 2$, for some $C > 0$. Therefore, Lemma 2.1 may be applied locally to the Liouville systems (2.14) and (2.16). By analogous arguments as above, we conclude that there exists $\widetilde{w}_2^1$ such that $\widetilde{w}_{2,n}^2 \to \widetilde{w}_2^1$ locally uniformly in $\mathbb{R}^2$ with

$$\gamma \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \widetilde{V}_2^2 e^{\widetilde{w}_2^1} \geq 8\pi.$$

That is,

$$m_2(p_0) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \widetilde{V}_2^2 e^{\widetilde{w}_2^1} \geq \frac{8\pi}{\gamma},$$

as desired. □

3. Proof of Theorem 1.2

We recall from Section 1 that the variational functional for problem (1.1) is given by:

$$J(u) = \frac{1}{2}\int_\Sigma |\nabla_g v|^2 - \lambda_1 \log \int_\Sigma e^v - \frac{\lambda_2}{\gamma}\log \int_\Sigma e^{-\gamma v}, \quad v \in \mathcal{E}.$$

We begin by checking that J admits a mountain pass geometry for all $(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) \in \Lambda$.

Lemma 3.1 (Existence of a local minimum)**.** *Fix $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \geq 0$. If*

$$\lambda_1 + \gamma\lambda_2 < \mu_1(\Sigma)\,|\Sigma|,$$

then $v \equiv 0$ is a strict local minimum for J.

Proof. We set

$$G_1(v) := \log\left(\int_\Sigma e^v\, dV_g\right), \quad G_2(v) := \log\left(\int_\Sigma e^{-\gamma v}\, dV_g\right),$$

so that we may write

$$J(v) = \frac{1}{2}\int_\Sigma |\nabla_g v|^2 - \lambda_1 G_1(v) - \frac{\lambda_2}{\gamma} G_2(v).$$

For every $\phi \in \mathcal{E}$, we compute:

$$G_1'(v)\phi = \int_\Sigma \frac{e^v\phi}{\int_\Sigma e^v}; \qquad G_2'(v)\phi = \int_\Sigma \frac{-\gamma e^{\gamma v}\phi}{\int_\Sigma e^{-\gamma v}}.$$

Moreover, for every $\phi, \psi \in \mathcal{E}$,

$$\langle G_1''(v)\phi, \psi\rangle = \frac{\left(\int_\Sigma e^v\phi\psi\right)\left(\int_\Sigma e^v\right) - \left(\int_\Sigma e^v\phi\right)\left(\int_\Sigma e^v\psi\right)}{\left(\int_\Sigma e^v\right)^2}.$$

$$\langle G_2''(v)\phi, \psi\rangle = \gamma^2\frac{\left(\int_\Sigma e^{-\gamma v}\phi\psi\right)\left(\int_\Sigma e^{-\gamma v}\right) - \left(\int_\Sigma e^{-\gamma v}\phi\right)\left(\int_\Sigma e^{-\gamma v}\psi\right)}{\left(\int_\Sigma e^{-\gamma v}\right)^2}.$$

In particular, for every $\phi \in \mathcal{E}$, we derive that

$$G_1'(0)\phi = G_2'(0)\phi = 0; \quad \langle G_1''(0)\phi, \phi\rangle = \frac{1}{|\Sigma|}\int_\Sigma \phi^2; \quad \langle G_2''(0)\phi, \phi\rangle = \frac{\gamma^2}{|\Sigma|}\int_\Sigma \phi^2. \tag{3.1}$$

Consequently, for every $\phi \in \mathcal{E}$,

$$J'(0)\phi = 0, \qquad \langle J''(0)\phi, \phi\rangle = \int_\Sigma |\nabla\phi|^2 - \frac{\lambda_1 + \gamma\lambda_2}{|\Sigma|}\int_\Sigma \phi^2. \tag{3.2}$$

Recalling the Poincaré inequality

$$\int_\Sigma \phi^2 \leq \frac{1}{\mu_1(\Sigma)}\int_\Sigma |\nabla\phi|^2, \qquad \forall \phi \in \mathcal{E},$$

where $\mu_1(\Sigma)$ is the first eigenvalue defined in (1.8), we deduce by Taylor expansion at 0 that

$$\begin{aligned} J(u) - J(0) &= J'(0)u + \frac{1}{2}\langle J''(0)u, u\rangle + o(\|u\|^2) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2}\left(1 - \frac{\lambda_1 + \gamma\lambda_2}{\mu_1(\Sigma)|\Sigma|}\right)\|u\| + o(\|u\|^2), \end{aligned} \tag{3.3}$$

for all $u \in \mathcal{E}$. Hence, 0 is a local minimum for J, as asserted. □

In the next lemma we check that there exists a direction for J along which J is unbounded from below.

Lemma 3.2. *If $\max\{\lambda_1, \gamma\lambda_2\} > 8\pi$, then there exists $v_1 \in \mathcal{E}$ such that $J(v_1) < 0$ and $\|v_1\| \geq 1$.*

Proof. The unboundedness from below of J, i.e., the existence of v_1, may be derived simply inserting the special form of $\mathcal{P}$ given by (1.4) into formula (1.5). However, since the Struwe monotonicity argument also requires a control on $\|v_1\|$, we use a family of test functions derived from the classical "Liouville bubbles". Namely, we fix $p_0 \in \Sigma$ and $r_0 > 0$ a constant smaller than the injectivity radius of Σ at p_0. Let $\mathcal{B}_{r_0} = \{p \in \Sigma : \ d_g(p, p_0) < r_0\}$ denote the geodesic ball of radius r_0 centered at p_0. For every $\varepsilon > 0$ let U_ε be the function defined by

$$U_\varepsilon(p) = \begin{cases} \log \frac{\varepsilon^2}{(\varepsilon^2 + d_g(p,p_0)^2)^2} & \text{in } \mathcal{B}_{r_0} \\ \log \frac{\varepsilon^2}{(\varepsilon^2 + r_0^2)^2} & \text{in } \Sigma \setminus \mathcal{B}_{r_0}. \end{cases}$$

Let $v_\varepsilon \in \mathcal{E}$ be defined by

$$v_\varepsilon = U_\varepsilon - \frac{1}{|\Sigma|} \int_\Sigma U_\varepsilon \, dV_g.$$

By elementary computations we have

$$\int_\Sigma |\nabla_g U_\varepsilon|^2 \, dV_g = 16\pi \log \frac{1}{\varepsilon^2} + O(1);$$
$$\frac{1}{|\Sigma|} \int_\Sigma U_\varepsilon \, dV_g = \ln \varepsilon^2 + O(1);$$

and therefore

$$\int_\Sigma |\nabla_g v_\varepsilon|^2 \, dV_g = 16\pi \log \frac{1}{\varepsilon^2} + O(1);$$
$$\log \int_\Sigma e^{v_\varepsilon} \, dV_g = \log \frac{1}{\varepsilon^2} + O(1);$$
$$\log \int_\Sigma e^{-a v_\varepsilon} \, dV_g = O(1), \quad \forall a > 0.$$

By assumption we have $\lambda_1 > 8\pi$ or $\lambda_2 > 8\pi/\gamma$. Suppose $\lambda_1 > 8\pi$. Then, in view of the expansions above, we have:

$$J(v_\varepsilon) = (8\pi - \lambda_1) \log \frac{1}{\varepsilon^2} + O(1),$$

and therefore there exists $\varepsilon_1 > 0$ such that $v_1 := v_{\varepsilon_1}$ satisfies the desired properties. Suppose $\lambda_2 > 8\pi/\gamma$. Then,

$$J(-\frac{v_\varepsilon}{\gamma}) = \frac{1}{\gamma}(\frac{8\pi}{\gamma} - \lambda_2) \log \frac{1}{\varepsilon^2} + O(1),$$

and the statement holds true in this case as well. □

In particular, Lemma 3.1 and Lemma 3.2 imply that the functional J admits a mountain-pass geometry whenever $(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) \in \Lambda$.

Finally, in order to conclude the proof of Theorem 1.2 we need the following consequences of Theorem 1.1.

Lemma 3.3. *The following properties hold.*

(i) *For every $p \in \mathcal{S}_1 \cap \mathcal{S}_2$ we have*

$$m_1 + \gamma m_2 \geq 16\pi(1 + \gamma). \tag{3.4}$$

(ii) *If $\mathcal{S}_1 \setminus \mathcal{S}_2 \neq \emptyset$, then $r_1 \equiv 0$; in particular, in this case $\lambda_{1,0} = 8\pi \, \sharp \mathcal{S}_1$. Similarly, if $\mathcal{S}_2 \setminus \mathcal{S}_1 \neq \emptyset$, then $r_2 \equiv 0$ and $\lambda_{2,0} = \frac{8\pi}{\gamma} \, \sharp \mathcal{S}_2$.*

Proof. Proof of Part (i). In view of Theorem 1.1 and identity (2.3) it suffices to show that

$$\alpha_\gamma := \min \left\{ x + \gamma y : \ x \geq 8\pi, \ y \geq \frac{8\pi}{\gamma}, \ (x-y)^2 = 8\pi(x + \frac{y}{\gamma}) \right\} = 16\pi(1+\gamma). \tag{3.5}$$

Let $\mathbf{p} := \{(x,y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : \ (x-y)^2 = 8\pi(x + \frac{y}{\gamma})\}$ be the parabola defined by the quadratic relation (2.3). Let $\overline{x}, \overline{y} > 0$ be such that $(\overline{x}, \frac{8\pi}{\gamma}) \in \mathbf{p}$ and $(8\pi, \overline{y}) \in \mathbf{p}$. In view of the geometric properties of $\mathbf{p}$ we find that

$$\alpha_\gamma = \min\{\overline{x} + 8\pi, 8\pi + \gamma\overline{y}\}.$$

Solving the equation $(x-y)^2 = 8\pi(x+\frac{y}{\gamma})$ with respect to x, we have

$$x(y) = x_\pm(y) = y + 4\pi \pm \sqrt{8\pi(1+\frac{1}{\gamma})y + 16\pi^2}.$$

We deduce that

$$\overline{x} = x_+(\frac{8\pi}{\gamma}) = 8\pi(1+\frac{2}{\gamma}).$$

Similarly, solving $(x-y)^2 = 8\pi(x+\frac{y}{\gamma})$ with respect to y, we have

$$y = y_\pm(x) = x + \frac{4\pi}{\gamma} \pm \sqrt{8\pi(1+\frac{1}{\gamma}x + \frac{16\pi^2}{\gamma^2})}.$$

We conclude that

$$\overline{y} = y_+(8\pi) = 8\pi(2+\frac{1}{\gamma}).$$

It follows that

$$\alpha_\gamma = \min\{16\pi(1+\frac{1}{\gamma}),\, 16\pi(1+\gamma)\} = 16\pi(1+\gamma).$$

Proof of Part (ii). Let

$$u_{1,n} = G * \lambda_{1,n}\frac{e^{v_n}}{\int_\Sigma e^{v_n}}, \qquad\qquad u_{2,n} = G * \lambda_{2,n}\frac{e^{-\gamma v_n}}{\int_\Sigma e^{-\gamma v_n}},$$

where $G = G(x,p)$ denotes the Green's function defined by

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_x G(\cdot,p) = \delta_p - \frac{1}{|\Sigma|} & \text{on } \Sigma \\ \int_\Sigma G(\cdot,p)\, dV_g = 0 \end{cases}$$

and where $*$ denotes convolution. Then, $v_n = u_{1,n} - u_{2,n}$. For a measurable function f defined on a subset of Σ and for any $T > 0$ we set $f^T = \min\{f, T\}$. Suppose $p \in \mathcal{S}_1 \setminus \mathcal{S}_2$. We claim that

$$\int_\Sigma e^{v_n} \to +\infty. \tag{3.6}$$

Indeed, we have, using (1.6) and Theorem 1.1:

$$u_{1,n}(x) \geq G^T * \lambda_{1,n}\frac{e^{v_n}}{\int_\Sigma e^{v_n}} \to G^T * \sum_{p\in\mathcal{S}_1}(m_1(p)+r_1) \geq 8\pi G^T(x,p) - C.$$

In local coordinates centered at p we obtain

$$u_{1,n}(X) \geq \ln[\frac{1}{|X|^4}]^T - C.$$

Since $p \notin \mathcal{S}_2$, we have that $\|u_{2,n}\|_{L^\infty(B_\rho(p))}$ is uniformly bounded with respect to n, for some sufficiently small $\rho > 0$. Now, Fatou's lemma implies that

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty}\int_\Sigma e^{v_n} = \liminf_{n\to\infty}\int_\Sigma e^{u_{1,n}-u_{2,n}} \geq c_0\int_{B_\rho(p)}[\frac{1}{|X|^4}]^T$$

for some $c_0 > 0$ independent of n. Letting $T \to +\infty$, we deduce that (3.6) holds true, and consequently $r_1 \equiv 0$.

Now, we assume that $p \in \mathcal{S}_2 \setminus \mathcal{S}_1$. Similarly as above, we claim that

$$\int_\Sigma e^{-\gamma v_n} \to +\infty. \tag{3.7}$$

Indeed, we note that

$$u_{2,n}(x) \geq G^T * \lambda_{2,n}\frac{e^{-\gamma v_n}}{\int_\Sigma e^{-\gamma v_n}} \to G^T * \sum_{p\in\mathcal{S}_2}(m_2(p)\delta_p + r_2) \geq \frac{8\pi}{\gamma}\sum_{p\in\mathcal{S}_2} G^T(x,p) - C,$$

for some $C > 0$ independent of n. In particular, in local coordinates X near p,

$$u_{2,n}(X) \geq \frac{4}{\gamma}\ln[\frac{1}{|X|}]^T - C.$$

On the other hand, since $p \notin \mathcal{S}_1$, we have that $\|u_{1,n}\|_{L^\infty(B_\rho(p))}$ is bounded independently of n in a ball centered at p provided $\rho > 0$ is sufficiently small. We conclude that

$$\int_\Sigma e^{-\gamma v_n} \geq c_0 \int_{B_\rho(p)} [\frac{1}{|X|^4}]^T.$$

In view of Fatou's lemma and letting $T \to +\infty$, we derive (3.7). Therefore, $r_2 \equiv 0$, as asserted. □

Finally, we provide the proof of Theorem 1.2.

Proof of Theorem 1.2. In view of Struwe's Monotonicity Trick, for almost every $(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) \in \Lambda$ there exists a nontrivial solution to (1.1). As this argument is by now standard, we refer to [29, 30] for a proof. A detailed proof in this specific context may also be found in [24]. Let $(\lambda_1^0, \lambda_2^0) \in \Lambda$ be fixed. Let $(\lambda_{1,n}, \lambda_{2,n}, v_n)$ be a solution sequence for (1.1) with $\lambda_{1,n} \to \lambda_1^0$ and $\lambda_{2,n} \to \lambda_2^0$, $(\lambda_{1,n}, \lambda_{2,n}) \in \Lambda$. We claim that v_n converges to some $v \in \mathcal{E}$, solution to (1.1). To this aim we exploit the blow up analysis as derived in Theorem 1.1. By contradiction we assume that $p_0 \in \mathcal{S}$. If $p_0 \in \mathcal{S}_1 \setminus \mathcal{S}_2$, then in view of Lemma 3.3–(ii) we have $\lambda_1^0 \in 8\pi\mathbb{N}$, a contradiction to (1.10). If $p_0 \in \mathcal{S}_2 \setminus \mathcal{S}_1$, then in view of Lemma 3.3–(ii) we have $\lambda_2^0 \in \frac{8\pi}{\gamma}\mathbb{N}$, a contradiction to (1.10). Suppose that $p_0 \in \mathcal{S}_1 \cap \mathcal{S}_2$. In this case, using (3.4),

$$\lambda_1 + \gamma\lambda_2 \geq m_1(p_0) + \gamma m_2(p_0) \geq 16\pi(1+\gamma)$$

and we again obtain a contradiction to (1.10). Hence, the compactness for the solution sequence $(\lambda_{1,n}, \lambda_{2,n}, v_n)$ holds and Theorem 1.2 is completely established. □

Acknowledgments. This work is supported by Progetto GNAMPA-INDAM 2015: *Alcuni aspetti di equazioni ellittiche non lineari*. The first author is also supported by PRIN *Aspetti variazionali e perturbativi nei problemi differenziali nonlineari*. The second author is also supported by Progetto STAR 2015: *Variational Analysis and Equilibrium Models in Physical and Socio-Economic Phenomena.*

References

[1] Bartolucci, D., Pistoia, A., *Existence and qualitative properties of concentrating solutions for the sinh-Poisson equation*, IMA J. Appl. Math. 72 (2007), no. 6, 706–729.

[2] Brezis, H., Merle, F., *Uniform estimates and blow-up behavior for solutions of $-\Delta u = V(x)e^u$ in dimension 2,* Comm. Partial Differential Equations 16 (1991), 1223–1253.

[3] Caglioti, E., Lions, P.L., Marchioro, C., Pulvirenti, M., *A special class of stationary flows for two-dimensional Euler equations: a statistical mechanics description,* Comm. Math. Phys. 143 (1992), no. 3, 501–525.

[4] Chen, W., Li, C., *Classification of solutions of some nonlinear elliptic equations,* Duke Math. J. 63 (1991), 615–622.

[5] Chen, W., Li, C., *What kind of surfaces can admit constant curvature?,* Duke Math. J. 78 (1995), 437–451.

[6] Esposito, P., Grossi, M., Pistoia, A., *On the existence of blowing-up solutions for a mean field equation.* Ann. I. H. Poincaré, 22 (2005), 227–257.

[7] Eyink, G.L., Sreenivasan, K.R., *Onsager and the theory of hydrodynamic turbulence*, Reviews of Modern Physics 78 (2006), 87–135.

[8] Grossi, M., Pistoia, A., *Multiple blow-up phenomena for the sinh-Poisson equation.* Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal. 209 (2013), no. 1, 287–320.

[9] Jevnikar, A., *An existence result for the mean-field equation on compact surfaces in a doubly supercritical regime*, Proc. Roy. Soc. Edinburgh Sect. A 143 (2013), no. 5, 1021–1045.

[10] Jevnikar, A., Wei, J., Yang W., *Classification of blow-up limits for the sinh-Gordon equation*, arXiv:1602.02437.

[11] Jevnikar, A., Yang W., *Analytic aspects of the Tzitzéica equation: blow-up analysis and existence results,* arXiv:1605.01875.

[12] Jost, J., Wang, G., Ye, D., Zhou, C., *The blow up analysis of solutions of the elliptic sinh-Gordon equation.* Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations 31 (2008), no. 2, 263–276.

[13] Joyce, G., Montgomery, D., *Negative temperature states for the two-dimensional guiding centre plasma,* J. Plasma Phys., 10 (1973), 107–121.

[14] Lucia, M., Nolasco, M., *$SU(3)$ Chern-Simons vortex theory and Toda systems,* J. Differential Equations 184 (2002), 443–474.

[15] Ohtsuka, H., Ricciardi, T., Suzuki, T., *Blow-up analysis for an elliptic equation describing stationary vortex flows with variable intensities in 2D-turbulence,* J. Differential Equations 249 n. 6 (2010), 1436–1465.
[16] Ohtsuka, H., Suzuki, T., *A blow up analysis of the mean field equation for arbitrarily signed vortices,* Self-similar solutions of nonlinear PDE, 185–197, Banach Center Publ., 74, Polish Acad. Sci., Warsaw, 2006.
[17] Ohtsuka, H., Suzuki, T., *Mean field equation for the equilibrium turbulence and a related functional inequality,* Adv. Differential Equations 11 (2006), 281-304.
[18] Onsager, L., *Statistical hydrodynamics.* Nuovo Cimento Suppl. n. 2 **6** (9), (1949), 279–287.
[19] Pistoia, A., Ricciardi, T., *Concentrating solutions for a Liouville type equation with variable intensities in 2D-turbulence*, Nonlinearity, 29, no. 2, (2016), 271–297.
[20] Pointin, Y.B., Lundgren, T.S., *Statistical mechanics of two-dimensional vortices in a bounded container,* Phys. Fluids **19** (1976), 1459–1470.
[21] Ricciardi, T., Suzuki, T., *Duality and best constant for a Trudinger-Moser inequality involving probability measures,* J. of Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS) **16** (2014), 1327–1348.
[22] Ricciardi, T., Takahashi, R., Zecca, G., Zhang, X., *On the existence and blow-up of solutions for a mean field equation with variable intensities,* to appear on Atti Accad. Naz. Lincei Rend. Lincei Mat. Appl. (2016).
[23] Ricciardi, T., *Mountain-pass solutions for a mean field equation from two-dimensional turbulence,* Differential and Integral Equations 20 n. 5 (2007), 561–575.
[24] Ricciardi, T., Zecca, G., *Blow-up analysis for some mean field equations involving probability measures from statistical hydrodynamics,* Differential and Integral Equations 25 n. 3–4 (2012), 201–222.
[25] Ricciardi, T. , Zecca, G., *Mass quantization and minimax solutions for Neri's mean field equation in* $2D$*-turbulence,* Journal of Differential Equations, 260 (2016) 339–369.
[26] Ricciardi, T., Zecca, G. *On Neri's mean field equation with hyperbolic sine vorticity distribution*, Sci. Math. Jpn. 76 (2013), no. 3, 401–415.
[27] Sawada, K., Suzuki, T. *Derivation of the equilibrium mean field equations of point vortex and vortex filament system,* Theoret. Appl. Mech. Japan 56 (2008), 285–290.
[28] Shafrir, I., Wolansky, G., The logarithmic HLS inequality for systems on compact manifolds, J. Funct. Anal. **227** (2005), no. 1, 220–226.
[29] Struwe, M., *The existence of surfaces of constant mean curvature with free boundaries,* Acta Math. 160 (1988) 19–64.
[30] Struwe, M., Tarantello, G. *On multivortex solutions in Chern-Simons gauge theory,* Boll. Unione Mat. Ital. Sez.B 1 (1998), 109–121.
[31] Zhou, C., *Existence of solution for mean field equation for the equilibrium turbulence.* Nonlinear Anal. 69 (2008), no. 8, 2541–2552.

(Tonia Ricciardi) Dipartimento di Matematica e Applicazioni, Università di Napoli Federico II, Via Cintia, Monte S. Angelo, 80126 Napoli, Italy
E-mail address: tonricci@unina.it

(Gabriella Zecca) Dipartimento di Matematica e Applicazioni, Università di Napoli Federico II, Via Cintia, Monte S. Angelo, 80126 Napoli, Italy
E-mail address: g.zecca@unina.it